

Reports on the Units

June 2010

J281/J081/R/10

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Latin (J281)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Latin (J081)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
A401/01 Latin Language 1: Mythology and domestic life (Foundation Tier)	2
A401/02 Latin Language 1: Mythology and domestic life (Higher Tier)	4
A403/01 Latin Prose Literature (Foundation Tier)	6
A403/02 Latin Prose Literature (Higher Tier)	7
A404/01 Latin Verse Literature (Foundation Tier)	8
A404/02 Latin Verse Literature (Higher Tier)	9
A405/01 Sources for Latin (Foundation Tier)	11
A405/02 Sources for Latin (Higher Tier)	14

Chief Examiner's Report

In this, the first year of the new Specification, the profile of the candidature was very mixed, as might have been expected. Around three quarters of candidates were in Year 10, along with some in Year 9. Some centres were clearly entering candidates as a trial run for the first full Award in 2011. At Higher Tier, the highest entry was for Latin Language A401 (694), followed by Prose Literature A403 (296), Sources for Latin A405 (236) and Verse Literature A404 (140). Foundation Tier entries were in each case very much smaller.

The mixed nature of the cohort and the relatively small number of the entry made it hard to compare the overall performance of candidates; outcomes were therefore based more strongly than ever on the evidence of individual scripts on the respective units. For the first full Award in Summer 2011 the percentages of grades awarded are expected to be more closely aligned to the historical performance of candidates on the outgoing 1942 specification.

Centres are advised to read the Examiners' reports very closely, and particularly the guidance offered on the extended writing questions on Units A403, A404 and A405.

A401/01 Latin Language 1: Mythology and domestic life (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

There were many commendable attempts at this paper, perhaps aided by a familiar story line. Some candidates experienced difficulty with vocabulary, which, given the fact that there are only 200 words to learn, was surprising. The words less well known were *laetus*, *rogo*, *servo*, *traho*, *tristis*, *eo*, *terra* and *teneo*.

Candidates would be well advised to look at the mark allocation of the question that they are answering. For example, in Q3, there were three marks allocated, yet several candidates merely put down 'walking'. Three marks are never available for a one word answer.

Also, candidates should look carefully at the Latin words quoted in the question, as the answer is usually to be found there. For example, in Q6, '*Pluto, rex mortuorum*: who was Pluto?', the answer is whatever *rex mortuorum* means. As *mortuus* is given in the Vocabulary list, *mortuorum* must be 'of the dead', not 'of death', and the answer 'Pluto was a god' was unlikely to get any marks, as that information was given under the Names section.

Candidates would be well advised to stick to their first thoughts unless they have made an obvious error. It was regrettable to see so many examples of correct answers crossed out and an incorrect answer substituted. Candidates should also be advised not to give alternative answers (in brackets or after an oblique stroke), as alternatives are not allowed.

A small, but significant, point is that if candidates insert 'and' in their translation, where there is no such word in the Latin sentence, something has usually gone wrong, and they should look again at their translation. See below on Q15(a).

Comments on Individual Questions

In Section A, most of the comprehension questions caused little difficulty.

In Q1, 'god' was allowed for 'goddess' as the former is a generic form covering both genders.

Q2 and Q3 were generally well answered, apart from the failure of some candidates to give the full details noted above.

In Q4 and Q5, however, failure to look closely at the endings of the words led to frequent errors. In Q4, although *flos* was given in the Vocabulary list, several candidates took *flores* as singular; these candidates usually omitted any reference to *volebat* as well. In Q5, many candidates took *Proserpina* as the subject of both clauses, despite the endings of *amicæ Proserpinam videbant*. Candidates need to be aware that if a noun ends in *m*, it is bound to be Accusative case, unless it is a neuter noun, (which Proserpina was not). The same fault recurred in Q15 (a) (see below).

In Q7, some candidates only ticked one box, instead of two, but most coped well with this, and the following, 'tick the box' question.

Reports on the Units taken in June 2010

In Q9, there were many errors of carelessness, particularly omissions of words which the candidate probably knew, eg *tandem*, *tum* and *omnes*. Candidates should check each Latin word on the paper carefully to make sure that they have translated it. Also, candidates should be advised not to transpose active to passive, or vice versa, as key words are often omitted; for example, several candidates translated the sentence *deus me abducit* 'I am being abducted', without any reference to the god.

The two instances of *ut* caused problems. The indirect command was often incorrectly paraphrased, partly due to ignorance of *servaret*, which was confused with *servus*. In the last section, most candidates translated *peteret* as a main verb, omitting *ibat ut* altogether, but the participle *lacrimantem* was particularly well handled.

Section B caused few problems, apart from Q15 and Q16, though failure to look carefully at the endings of the Latin words led several candidates to choose option D in Q11, instead of B.

In Q12, ignorance of *nolo* led to vague statements such as 'He was angry', but familiarity with the story helped to produce very good answers to Q13 and Q14.

Vocabulary weaknesses caused problems in Q15(a), where *tenet* was not very familiar to candidates, and *terra* was often confused with *terreo*. Nevertheless, even if candidates do not know the meanings of the words, they should still look carefully at their endings. *Proserpinam* must be the Accusative case, and therefore the object of the verb *tenet*. The ending of *tenet* indicates a singular subject, yet a frequent answer was 'Pluto and Proserpina lived...', or a similar version, despite the absence of 'and' and the endings *Proserpinam tenet*.

In Q15 (b) some candidates ignored the wording of the question and wrote about the danger of wandering off on your own, or the affection between mothers and daughters, without any reference to the seasons and the way things grow.

Q16 was badly answered, which was surprising, as it was considered to be an easy source of marks for less strong candidates. Many misread the wording of the question and gave the English meaning of the **Latin** word, despite the clear wording of the question, the example given and the heading at the top of the table. Several candidates confused *terra* with *terreo*, but most coped with *habitabat*. There were many good examples of derivatives given, eg 'terracotta', 'terrestrial'.

Despite the criticisms given above, there were many good scripts, which reflected the hard work done by both the candidates and their teachers, for which they are to be congratulated.

A401/02 Latin Language 1: Mythology and domestic life (Higher Tier)

General Comments

There were many very commendable attempts at this paper, perhaps aided by a familiar story line.

Some candidates, however, experienced difficulty with vocabulary, which, given the fact that there are only 350 words to learn, was surprising. In Questions 1-8 the words less well known were *laetus* and *volo* while *puella* was often translated 'slave girl'. In Q10, the translation question, *rogo, fero, traho, tristis, eo, terra* and *invenio*, and in Section B, *nolo, debeo* and *teneo* were often unknown.

Candidates would be well advised to stick to their first thoughts unless they have made an obvious error. It was regrettable to see many examples of correct answers crossed out and an incorrect answer substituted. They should also be advised not to give alternative answers (in brackets or after an oblique stroke), as alternatives are not allowed.

A small, but significant, point is that if candidates insert 'and' in their translation, where there is no such word in the Latin sentence, something has usually gone wrong, and they should look again at their translation.

Above all, candidates should look very carefully at the endings of the Latin words. Examples of errors are given in individual questions below which a moment's attention could have avoided.

Comments on Individual Questions

In Section A, most of the comprehension questions caused little difficulty.

In Q1, 'god' was allowed for 'goddess' as the former is a generic form covering both genders.

Q2 and Q3 were generally well answered, though several candidates stated that she was led by her mother, mistakenly taking *cum* to mean 'by'.

In Q4 most candidates chose the correct answer 'D', but 'E' was a less common choice and some candidates put only one tick. 'A' and 'B' were chosen by several through failure to look closely at the endings of the words. *vidit* and *dixit* are clearly singular endings, so friends (*amicis*) cannot be the subject. Also, *-is* is not a nominative plural ending.

Q5 was badly answered, *nonne* causing confusion over which type of question it was, and both the meaning and the person of *vultis* were frequently incorrect, though *-tis* is common to all active tenses as the second person plural. 'tis you' may be a way of remembering it.

In Q6, *capta est* was often omitted, and the idea of being overcome was alien to many. However, most managed to get as far as 'she loved the flowers', which earned two of the three marks for this question.

In Q7, many candidates took Proserpina or the friends as the subject of both clauses, despite the endings of *amicarum Proserpinam videre poterant* and *Proserpina voces earum audiebat*. Candidates need to be aware that if a noun ends in *m*, it is bound to be accusative case, unless it is a neuter noun, which Proserpina was not.

Reports on the Units taken in June 2010

Q8 caused very few problems.

Problems arose among some candidates in Q9, largely owing to not reading the question properly or not giving an adequate explanation of the meaning of the derivative, merely putting 'sound' down as the meaning of 'audio'. Several misread the wording of the question and gave the English meaning of the **Latin** word, despite the clear wording of the question, the example given and the heading at the top of the table.

In Q10, a number of careless errors were made, particularly omissions of words which the candidate probably knew, eg *tamen*, *tandem*, *tristissima erat*, *numquam*, *deinde* and *omnes*. Candidates should check each Latin word on the paper carefully to make sure that they have translated it.

The first sentence caused little difficulty, other than the meaning of *ferret*. Many candidates translated *matrem rogavit* as 'asked for her mother', but credit was still given as long as the indirect command was correctly rendered. A purpose rendering ('in order to'), however, was treated as a minor error. In the second sentence, *quam crudeliter* defeated most, and the participle *lacrimantem* in the following sentence was often loosely translated as 'the cries'.

The passives *abducor* and *tractam esse* caused many problems. Conversely, the active *visuram esse* was often wrongly taken as the passive, which usually led to the omission of *se*.

The two instances of *ut* caused problems to some. The indirect command was often incorrectly paraphrased, eg 'asked for help', which was not accepted, probably due to ignorance of *ferret*. In the last section, many candidates translated *quaereret* as the main verb, omitting *ibat ut* altogether.

In Q11, many failed to spot that *vivere* was part of an indirect statement and put 'to live', which was not accepted.

In Q13, ignorance of *nolo* and confusion of *facere* with *facilis* led to vague statements such as 'He was easily angry', but familiarity with the story helped to produce very good answers to Q12, Q14 and Q15, where full marks were common.

In Q16(a), the passive voice again caused problems, even to those who knew the meaning of *tenetur*, which was not very often, and *terra* was sometimes confused with *terreo*.

In Q16 (b), too many candidates seemed to ignore the reference in the first sentence to explaining things in the natural world and wrote about the danger of wandering off on your own, walking in the woods or the affection between mothers and daughters, without reference to the seasons or the myth.

However, despite the criticisms given above, there were many good scripts, which reflected the hard work done by both the candidates and their teachers, for which they are to be congratulated.

A403/01 Latin Prose Literature (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

The standard of performance in the first year of the new specification was pleasing. The numbers sitting the Foundation Tier was small, but most candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the texts, although a small number had a very sketchy knowledge of the Latin and accordingly struggled, in particular on the extended answer questions.

- All but one candidate answered the questions on the Cambridge Latin Anthology.
- There were very few rubric errors, possibly due to the layout of the new paper.
- Candidates did not always quote the Latin when the question demanded it.
- Candidates appeared to have had enough time to complete the paper.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: OCR Latin Anthology for GCSE

Only one candidate answered this section.

Section B: Cambridge Latin Anthology

The questions on passage 1 were well answered. Most candidates answered Q20 correctly, but some misunderstood the meaning of *praemiis* in Q21. Most answered Q22 correctly although some wrongly answered teachers. Qs 23 and 24 were well answered. Most answered the multiple choice questions 25-29 correctly, although Qs25 and 28 confused the weaker candidates. Q30, the first extended writing question, was well answered by many, but some candidates omitted to quote the Latin in their answer. Some candidates did not refer to all three bullet points in their answers.

The questions on passage 4 were generally well answered but many candidates did not know the name of Boudica's husband for Q31, and some candidates did not understand the meaning of *avitis* in Q34. Q36, an extended writing question, was well answered with good coverage of the Latin. Q37, the 5 mark multiple choice question was generally well answered, but some candidates clearly guessed the answers as they did not have a firm understanding of the Latin. Q38 was well answered by many, but proved a good differentiator. Most answered Q39 well, although some candidates struggled to make three points.

A403/02 Latin Prose Literature (Higher Tier)

General Comments

The standard of performance in the first year of the new specification was pleasing. Most candidates had a good knowledge of the text and there were some outstanding answers, although a small number of candidates demonstrated very little knowledge of the Latin and struggled to answer more than the bare minimum.

- The majority of candidates answered the questions on the Cambridge Latin Anthology.
- There were very few rubric errors, possibly due to the layout of the new paper.
- Candidates did not always quote the Latin when the question demanded it.
- Candidates appeared to have had enough time to complete the paper.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: OCR Latin Anthology for GCSE

Most candidates answered Questions 1-4 correctly. Q5 was not fully answered by some candidates who missed out or mistranslated *paucos*. The extended writing questions were good differentiators and Q6 was not fully answered in weaker scripts. Some candidates did not quote the Latin fully and did not address all three bullet points fully. Q7, the translation question, was well answered by many and it was clear when candidates had a good knowledge of the Latin and when they did not. Candidates should be careful not to omit words in their translation. The overarching Q8 was generally well answered, with many candidates having an excellent understanding of Agrippina's portrayal by Tacitus. Weaker candidates made rough generalisations in response to this question. Q9 was well answered, but some candidates struggled with Q10 which required picking out and translating a Latin word from the text. Qs11-13 were good differentiators, as some candidates found passage 5 challenging. Weaker candidates found Q14 difficult and did not always address the three bullet points or quote the Latin.

Section B: Cambridge Latin Anthology

Qs15-18 on passage 1 were well answered by most, although some candidates struggled to pick out and translate the Latin phrase in Q16. The answers to passage 2, Qs19-22 were also well answered. Some candidates wrongly gave the answer 'murder' for Q20 and many candidates missed out the comparative 'more pleasing' in Q21. The overarching Q23 was well answered by most. The extended writing Q24 was a good differentiator, with less strong candidates not addressing all three bullet points or quoting the Latin in their answer. The third bullet point, on the attack by the Roman soldiers, was not answered well in weaker scripts. Q25 was well answered, but some candidates struggled to pick out and translate the Latin adverb for Q26. The translation Q27 was generally well answered, but it was clear that some candidates did not have a sufficiently good understanding of the Latin. The extended writing Q28 was again a good differentiator and some candidates found it hard to address all three bullet points fully.

A404/01 Latin Verse Literature (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

This unit was taken by three candidates only. It will not therefore be possible to provide a report on candidates' performance.

A404/02 Latin Verse Literature (Higher Tier)

General Comments

For this first sitting of the new examination, candidates' performance did not seem as strong as on the equivalent legacy paper. Factors which may help to explain this include:

- the small total number of candidates and centres means that the pattern of results is not necessarily representative of the full national picture;
- many candidates taking this examination are one year younger than the cohort for the legacy GCSE;
- the inclusion of three substantial questions, each worth 8 or 10 marks, may perhaps demand a different sort of preparation.

Whereas well-prepared candidates were often able to achieve high marks on the majority of shorter questions, responses to the longer questions consistently lacked sufficient reference to the aspects of style in the Latin. Candidates understandably tended to work through the bullet-points like a 'shopping list' – making one or two points under each heading, then tagging on Latin quotations which amounted to mere decoration rather than chosen as a basis for any comment on the 'choice and position of words and any other stylistic features'. The quality of translations in both sections varied enormously, many more being poor or patchy (sometimes non-existent) than the number of those which showed signs of any real fluency.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: OCR GCSE Latin Anthology

The opening series of questions on the Ovid passage gave most candidates a good start, though for both Questions 4 and 7 more might have realised that a literal translation of the phrases concerned (i.e. 'he is comparing great things with small' or 'my foot was indulging my mind') was unlikely to make a satisfactory response to the question. The minority of good attempts at the translation in Q5 sometimes struggled to fit the final line convincingly to the remainder or omitted incidental phrases such as *passis capillis* and *ore tremente*. Qs9-13 on Catullus generally proved quite straightforward, except to candidates at the lowest end of the ability range. Of the longer questions, Q8 yielded plenty of relevant content from the majority, but even simple points relating to the choice or position of Latin words were fairly rare. A similar approach to Q14 (Sulpicia) was not quite so successful, largely owing to the difficult train of thought expressed by the author. Comments here tended to become rather repetitive, with Latin again quoted as an appendage rather than analysed in terms of its literary effect. For Q15, where referring to Latin was not an issue, there were some quite pleasing essays - impressive more, however, for their range than depth, often doing no more than touching on one or two details per author or poem.

Section B : Virgil, *Aeneid VI*

Here, though stronger candidates again sailed through them all quite easily, the shorter questions exposed those not in command of the Latin. Some seemed not even to recognise the context immediately: Charon and Aeneas were named in Q16 as frequently as the Sibyl, and for Q18 all sorts of words appeared - including *ferruginea* from a different passage. Questions 19, 20, 23, 24 and 28 were generally better done, but candidates sometimes gave little or no indication of how details identified in the simile projected onto the scene beside the river, and in Q26 even identifying which part of the Underworld was being described proved beyond some. Answers to Q29 such as 'What is going on beside the river?' were close but not exactly the questions which Aeneas asks his father, which are in fact 'What are those rivers, and who are those men ... etc?' The standard of translation in Q22 was generally weak, including the familiar pitfalls 'damned' for *damnati* and 'crimes' for *crimina*, and often no rendering at all of the opening

Reports on the Units taken in June 2010

phrase *hos iuxta*. Of the longer questions, Q21 proved easiest, giving even weaker candidates an opportunity to catalogue Cerberus' offputting characteristics – generally, however, without paying much attention to stylistic features of the Latin. Even when Latin was quoted, it was often given in meaningless chunks (such as *rabida tria guttura*), and there was much distortion of the sense (eg *horrere* understood as 'horrid' or 'horrifying', and comments about caves being 'bad places'). Q25 yielded several excellent commentaries on what Anchises says (eg the implied reference to Aeneas' time with Dido), but little systematic analysis of how the style of Virgil's writing contributes to the effectiveness of the passage. Q26 proved a demanding final hurdle: only the most resourceful candidates were able to suggest aspects of *Aeneid VI* which might offer any grounds for hope, and even then perhaps only for a select few (eg those who are admitted to Elysium), whereas the downside for the many (such as those turned away from the Styx by Charon) seemed only too clear!

A405/01 Sources for Latin (Foundation Tier)

General Comments

The Sources for Latin unit in the new Specification was designed to be accessible both to centres that have been entering candidates for the Roman Life paper (1942/15) and to centres where candidates have been submitting coursework (1942/06). The aim is to offer scope for candidates to study the Roman world both for its intrinsic interest and as the context for their language and literary studies, and to do so via the study of primary source material (textual, visual or archaeological) as a means of enhancing the skills of reading, comprehension, analysis and evaluation that can benefit candidates across the Specification.

The areas of Roman life set out in the Specification provide a framework for the selection of primary source material to be studied rather than prescribed topics, and the booklet of sources provided for this unit by OCR, supplemented by any other source material available to centres, forms a bank of items to develop candidates' skills in handling primary sources rather than prescribed material. The unit was also designed to provide flexibility in terms of both time and resources where this is helpful.

With a small entry at Foundation Tier, generalisation is necessarily limited, but in this first year of the new Specification, the examiners were encouraged by the candidates' responses to the paper. Reference to sources outside those provided with the question paper is invited, but on the whole candidates confined themselves to the ones in front of them. However, they made good use of them, and showed they could evaluate the sources and their content.

One of the aims of this unit is that by comparing sources and identifying ways in which sources are useful or ways in which they might be limited, candidates will be developing the skills of compiling and evaluating information about the Roman world. The answers of many candidates showed impressive evidence of these skills, in varying amounts but over the whole range of performance, especially in Question 5(b).

Candidates performed well on both the short questions and 12-mark and 6-mark extended writing questions. Where more than one point was asked for in answer to the short questions, full marks were awarded only where the points made were distinctive: overlapping answers were not credited. For the 12-mark and 6-mark questions, the mark was arrived by reference to the bands set out in the marking grids and a position selected within the band according to the detail of the answer and also, in the case of the 12-mark question, the performance on the Quality of Written Communication (QWC) criteria.

Comments on Individual Questions

Questions 1 and 2

These questions caused few problems, the majority of candidates gaining full marks.

Question 3

This question invited candidates to deduce facts implied by the source rather than stated in it and was well done.

Question 4

Most candidates chose to promise a luxurious dinner rather than affecting simplicity, and demonstrated a good knowledge of the kinds of foods and entertainment that might have been offered. While answering the question involved re-using information from the sources, this was ingeniously done, although a few answers were rather too modern in tone.

Question 5(a)

This presented no problems, most candidates making two distinct points.

Question 5(b)

Candidates recognised that they were dealing with Columella's opinion here – and their own opinion – and scored highly for balanced answers, some candidates choosing both to agree and disagree.

Questions 6(a) and (b)

Candidates scored well on these questions provided they did not mention a kind of grain (a) or tasks that were not repairs (b).

Question 7

The Latin presented no problems, but 7(c) was the least well done part, possibly because candidates were trying to do something more complicated than apply their reading of the inscription (translated) to the question.

Question 8

Most candidates correctly interpreted the ovens as evidence for bread-making, and were successful in identifying an 'occupational health' issue.

Question 9

A wide range of answers was given.

Question 10

Answers encompassed a number of farming tasks derived from the sources, including references in some cases to there being a mill on the farm. Candidates picked up on relevant details: Columella was quoted as one 'master's' adviser on farm management, while there were several foremen who had clearly been chosen with Columella's advice in mind, even to the point of being described as 'ugly'. Most candidates were conscious that the farm had to be profitable, and tended to follow the school of thought that believed benign masters got more work out of their slaves. Higher marks were awarded where a range of aspects of running a farm were described, with some detail, and where there was some awareness of how the different tasks and personnel were interdependent. QWC was generally of a good standard.

Summary

The candidates have scored well on this paper, demonstrating that they can make good use of the sources they have studied. As candidates prepare for this paper, they should be reminded of the importance of reading the questions carefully, using the required source or sources, deriving as much of the evidence as possible from the sources and looking for opportunities to include evaluative comments. Where questions invite opinion or speculation, answers should be clearly based on evidence. Candidates should also have the confidence to use other sources they have studied, in addition to those in the Insert.

In general, the examiners appreciated these first papers of the new unit as encouraging examples of the use and evaluation of primary source material at GCSE level.

A405/02 Sources for Latin (Higher Tier)

General Comments

The Sources for Latin unit in the new Specification was designed to be accessible both to centres that have been entering candidates for the Roman Life paper (1942/25) and to centres where candidates have been submitting coursework (1942/06). The aim is to offer scope for candidates to study the Roman world both for its intrinsic interest and as the context for their language and literary studies, and to do so via the study of primary source material (textual, visual or archaeological) as a means of enhancing the skills of reading, comprehension, analysis and evaluation that can benefit candidates across the Specification.

The areas of Roman life set out in the Specification provide a framework for the selection of primary source material to be studied rather than prescribed topics, and the booklet of sources provided for this unit by OCR, supplemented by any other source material available to centres, forms a bank of items to develop candidates' skills in handling primary sources rather than prescribed material. The unit was also designed to provide flexibility in terms of both time and resources where this is helpful.

In this first year of the new Specification, the examiners were encouraged by the candidates' responses to the paper. Reference to sources outside those provided with the question paper is required at this level; candidates who ignored this requirement or felt unable to meet it could be given only limited credit for answers which did not mention sources or only the ones on the Insert. Many candidates however used additional sources with considerable detail and accuracy. The Specification encourages the idea that items of primary source material can provide evidence for several aspects of the ancient world, and candidates responded by using Seneca's letter about the baths and sources on patronage as evidence for food.

One of the aims of this unit is that by comparing sources and identifying ways in which sources are useful or ways in which they might be limited, candidates will be developing the skills of compiling and evaluating information about the Roman world. The answers of many candidates showed impressive evidence of these skills, in varying amounts but over the whole range of performance, especially in questions 4 and 7. In isolated cases, full marks could not be awarded in some questions that asked for information, because the candidate had evaluated the sources in *too much* depth, at the expense of demonstrating knowledge of the topic.

Candidates performed well on both the short questions and 12-mark and 6-mark extended writing questions. Where more than one point was asked for in answer to the short questions, full marks were awarded only where the points made were distinctive: overlapping answers were not both credited. For the 12-mark and 6-mark questions, the mark was arrived by reference to the bands set out in the marking grids and a position selected within the band according to the detail of the answer and also, for the 12-mark question, the performance on the Quality of Written Communication (QWC) criteria.

Candidates appeared to engage with the sources with enthusiasm, writing at greater length in many cases than had been anticipated. Most finished the paper, though some candidates ran out of time, among them some of those who had written at length.

Comments on Individual Questions

Questions 1(a) and (b)

These questions caused few problems, provided candidates made points that did not overlap.

Questions 2 (a) and (b)

Most candidates distinguished the jobs that were repairs from others mentioned by Cato, and identified the largely economic factors underlying the instruction to give sick slaves less food.

Question 3

(a) and (b) were answered without difficulty. A few candidates gave English rather than Latin phrases. (c) was not as consistently well done, candidates sometimes interpreting the inscription, wrongly, rather than quoting it. The answers of some candidates to (d) were impressive, with a range of information derived from inscriptions and specific examples of inscriptions, suggesting extensive study of the inscriptions in the sources booklet and others. Other candidates restricted their observations to the inscription in the Insert, including accurate but more limited information. Only a small number of candidates confused inscriptions with sources generally.

Question 4

Candidates produced good summaries of the working conditions in the mill and the effect on the slaves. However, the question was also looking for comment on how the *nature* of the source would make it effective. This question therefore emerged as an effective discriminator, with full marks awarded only to candidates who included some evaluation of the style of the source (for example, the emotive style of the description, the way the humiliation of the slaves was conveyed) or its reliability (for example, the fact that it was written as an eye-witness account but also as fiction, and written by a donkey albeit one with a human mind)!

Question 5

This 12-mark question was well answered, and candidates showed how they could use the information from the sources supplied and refer to other sources they had studied. Most candidates wrote an empathetic essay (they could be awarded full marks only if they did so) and ingeniously used a variety of sources to indicate the qualities required in a foreman and the drudgery of the slaves. Columella was mentioned as having an advisory role, and a new donkey called Lucius had arrived in one of the mills, as well as various town slaves needing to be toughened up. There was effective creative writing, but much as this was enjoyed by the examiners, marks were awarded on the basis of content: the range of jobs mentioned and their interrelation, the amount of material recognisably derived from sources and the way it was used. Some candidates had a very thorough knowledge of the passages from Columella not included in the Insert. This question also enabled more able candidates to imagine the positive and negative points of the job, depending on relations with the owner of the villa, who was often, though not always, presented as being more harsh than the foreman, and in some cases rather too much of the answer was devoted to the disciplining of slaves.

The performance on the QWC criteria was quite wide and some candidates' marks were at a lower point in the band as a result.

Question 6

Most candidates identified wealth and a varied diet as things the mosaic showed about its owner.

Question 7

Comparatively few candidates achieved the full three marks for this question, as some element of evaluation was required ('How useful are sources E, F and G...'), such as comparison, an indication of possible bias or a comment on the limitations of particular sources. Where evaluation was included it was thoughtfully done.

Question 8

Despite the clearly emboldened '**other**' sources, many candidates based their answers largely on the sources in the Insert for which only limited credit could be given. Other candidates referred in detail to sources such as Juvenal, Martial, Horace's town and country mice, and visual and archaeological evidence from Pompeii, some including evaluation of the sources although it was not explicitly asked for in the question.

Question 9

Apart from a very small number of candidates who described other forms of entertainment at dinner parties, most candidates described chariot racing or gladiatorial games. There were a few instances of confusion between the two, but in general there was evidence of sound knowledge of these entertainments, and the best answers both included information about the event and showed, as required, what information particular sources provide, such as Ovid's poem about the Circus or Augustine's account of the games, as well as visual sources.

Summary

Many candidates scored well on this paper, demonstrating that as required in some questions they can make good use of other sources they have studied, including less obvious ones. Others have been less successful. Candidates should bear in mind the following guidance:

- read the questions carefully
- use the required source or sources (those in the Insert and/or others)
- use the evidence derived from sources in as much detail as possible
- look for opportunities to include evaluative comments
- base opinion and speculation in their answers clearly on evidence.

In general, the examiners appreciated these first papers of the new unit as encouraging examples of the use and evaluation of primary source material at GCSE level.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2010

